

KNOW THY LORD

BY

SWAMI SATYAPRAKASH

1

Unfortunately, man is a queer animal, rather a queer species. Whatever he has touched, he claims it to be his own. I have before me a jug and a tumbler made of glass. If I ask you, who made these wares, you would immediately think of the man who in his factory has made them. But I ask you, who has made these flowers, these petals, or these leaves on the fine garland which you have so affectionately presented to me? Why do you not answer this question? I know, you would say, you have not made them, Or you would say, no man has made them, or none whom you could see or think of. Will you say, these things have been made by themselves? The Jug or the tumbler could not be made by it self. Then, do you mean that the producing of a flower is simpler than making of a jug? Since one is produced by itself and for the other, you need an artisan and a good deal of technique. Perhaps you would agree with me that the production of a petal or even a grass-blade is much more intricate, perhaps beyond the human means than that of a tumbler a calculating machine or a robot.

Man is an intelligent being. Wherever he is a maker, as in the making of a tumbler or jug, or a pot, he first needs a material to work with. He has a design in his mind, he has the capacity of accomplishing a particular object, and lastly he has a purpose behind it. The same thing is true of a painter and a sculpture. Man does not create his material, he borrows it from somewhere, sometimes directly, and sometimes indirectly. A potter needs clay, which he directly digs out from his surroundings. A glassblower gets his glass from the furnace; this glass he indirectly gets from sand and soda as must be occurring in his surroundings. A man who works with synthetic plastics derives his ultimate basic material from the surroundings. But who has made sand, stone, the oxides of iron, and the like, or the wood or cotton or silk? Do they come out of nothing without a designer or a technician?

Man has a peculiar vanity in his-self, that he very readily claims his creativeness or authorship, wherever he gives just a little of his

touch. In the direction of automation, he claims that he has made a bicycle, a locomotive engine, a motor car, an aeroplane, or a rocket. Of course, all this adds to the prestige and credit of man. But how poor all these locomotions are in comparison to what we have in the case of a fast moving deer, or an eagle that flies high in the sky, or the entire locomotion present in certain insects and aquatic and marine species! Think of the fuel necessary for the locomotive and think of wonders as to how it works. Is it not amazing? The man's prestige is enhanced when he is able to imitate something that exists in his surroundings. We give credit to him for a large number of chemicals that he has synthesized, -sometimes with an impact on natural products also, as in the case of synthetic indigo which entirely wiped out the indigo-plantation. But think of the simplicity of the processes with which our surrounding works in Nature's entire factory. A few seeds sown in earth gives the entire cotton. Each silkworm has a miniature factory of producing silk at the normal temperature and conditions in its body, and just on mulberry as basic material. Is it not amazing? Take our own case. We take a few morsels of food, a little fat, carbohydrate or protein, and within a few hours it turns out blood, bone or the muscle, and all this in such a simple way. We have not to use heavy or fine chemicals for this industry, neither very high temperatures nor high pressures. Each one of us does so, and yet he does not know how it is done.

Do you think, you are the chemist or technician in converting the food-ingredients into the tissues of the body? If you could do so, you must be a remarkable person. In case you are the doer or actor here, you must be in possession of the entire knowledge of doing so. Do you actually know how a piece of bread-morsel gets converted into a drop of blood and the like? I had once been addressing a gathering of children in a school, and I told these children that they were much better chemists than myself, an old aged man of over sixty years, since whatever they ate, they easily converted it to substances needed for their body, whereas the out-turn of my body-machine was so poor. Do you think that the child knows more chemistry than myself, since he synthesizes things in its body with much better ease than I could do? But don't you agree, that it is not a fact. In fact, neither in my body, nor in the body of a child, I or it are the producers or the manufacturers of various compounds which are being constantly produced every instant without our knowledge even.

In an industry, we employ a large staff of chemists, engineers and supervisors, and then one factory usually produces one or two products only for which it is designed. Then think of the laboratory of your body. Do you think, all the biochemical changes could go on so well designed and with such perfection without an engineer or a chemist? Is it not unthinkable? Who does so? Who repairs the factory when it goes wrong? Would you merely avoid answering all these questions? But there is no escape. You are not the doer. Somebody is doing as if *for* you. Every leaf of a plant is a factory, where is being manufactured the entire building material for the plant. Are we not thus living in wonderful surroundings, which have mysterious laboratories and factories working on simple, and yet highly complicated principles, not known to man? What you are able to do in your body, a monkey or a donkey does the same, a bird does the same, an insect does the same and so the mighty elephant. But none, in fact, is the doer. These beings are not the chemists, nor the engineers for what is happening in their body. Somebody else is manufacturing for them. Who is That?

Perhaps you might say, it is Nature that does all this. Are you satisfied with this answer? Do you know what you really mean by this Nature? Are you not avoiding to answer the question? Perhaps you do not understand the difference between *natural* and *unnatural*. You take it from me that our Nature transforms an *orderly* system to a chaos. To speak in terms of thermodynamics, left to nature, the entropy of a system would increase. Nature produces disorderliness. If you find somewhere a thousand of bricks arrayed in an orderly fashion, you would not say that bricks (lying somewhere chaotically) got by themselves set in a particular order. But it is possible that under *natural* forces, the orderly arranged bricks are haphazardly distributed over. So remember Nature does not transform a disorder into order. Under some other agency, an orderliness is brought about. The agency possesses a design in its mind (to speak in the language of man), and then works it out. Normally when you speak of Nature in the context of everything that you find coming out so beautifully planned and designed, you merely try to avoid to answer the question: Who works it out or who so designs?

Recently we have been trying to give another answer. We leave everything to *chance*. May I ask you a question? Given all the types which are in the printer's cases, A to Z, suppose there is a machine

which haphazardly is throwing out these types; how long would it take to have even the word *C-H-A-N-C-E* to be composed out, not to speak of a line from Shakespeare's poem or from Kalidasa's. We know how easy it is that you sow a seed of mango, and only a mango plant comes out of it. This cannot be left to chance at all. The science of chance or the science of probability is also a science, it has also some laws which can be mathematically expressed. The whole universe, so beautifully planned and designed, cannot be left to chance. It is inconceivable to explain the formation of even a small system of this creation, not to speak of the entire system.

The so-called natural world has three things : design, orderliness and purpose, It is not for me to convince you that this creation is bountiful in the orderliness and design. Who can deny it? Take your own body. Take the growth of a plant. Think of a flower. Think of the pollination. Think of the coming of a fruit. Then think of the distribution of seeds. Think of the laboratory that we have in every leaf. Then take the case of cosmos : The solar system with planets, the galaxies, nebulae, the expanding universe with its beauty. You will be amazed to see the design, the orderliness in it and not the chaos. The agency which is responsible for this design, which has the capacity to carry out the design, and which has the intelligence to supervise it is GOD. You may give Him any other name, and so long as you do not object to associate with the Agency the functions I have described or started, I shall not object, nor shall I quarrel.

The *Veda* says : Look to the creation of God; it neither gets old nor it decays. This is His poetry. God manifests Himself through His creation. People would very much like to see God. But why do they not see Him in the Creation? The *Veda* says, there are God's flag-marks in the creation, which one can easily see. If you want to see an artist, see him in his art. If you want to see a poet, see him in his poetry. If you want to see a painter, see him in his paintings, and if you want to see a mathematician, see him in his mathematics. These are the only places where you can see them. And so, why not see my Lord in His Creation. Every tiny speck here speaks of His glory.

The laws of the physical sciences, and so also of other sciences as are present on our planet, are also valid on other planets. I have been teaching all my life chemistry. I have been telling my audience, that the laws of chemistry on the Moon or the Mars would not be different

from those established here. Man has brought today on this Earth a little dust from the Moon and he would be studying it. The Moon is merely a child of this Earth; its composition will, therefore, be the same in conformity with the temperature, pressure and environmental conditions present there. The Earth herself came out of a binary star of which our present Sun is one of the twins. If you could produce the same temperature here on the Earth as is in the Sun, the nature of chemical reactions would be the same. At the high temperature of the Sun, the nuclei of the elements break up, and a bit of mass is converted into energy. This energy maintains the heat of the Sun otherwise it would have by now cooled down to a dead mass. In the Sun, we have condensation reactions, just as we have in the hydrogen bombs. The chemistry or physics of these nuclear condensations is exactly the same on the Earth as anywhere else. Then we have a large number of galaxies, similar to the galaxy to which we belong. The astro-physical laws are everywhere the same. This is the fundamental assumption of science. Science would have been no science if the law pervading at one place would have been different from the law pervading elsewhere. Not only that, the law that we have today was in existence yesterday also and would also be existing tomorrow. If this were not so, a law would not have been a law. A test-tube experiment performed at Allahabad, or Capetown on October 5, 1969, should be capable of being performed at London and New York in 2069 A. D. also. The science is based on this truth. Have you gone a little deeper into the implications of this presumption of scientists in this regard? Why should we have the laws the same for the whole space or for the whole time? Is there something unifying all places and all times? Yes, there is something which unifies all our laws, the one which is supreme, which is present everywhere (the Omnipresent), which is the maintainer of the uniformity of laws, and is the science of sciences (the Omniscient) and therefore which is the most potent (the Omnipotent). This Omnipresent, Omniscient and Omnipotent Being, when abbreviated in expressions is known as GOD. This is my *intellectual approach* towards God. This is the scientific approach. This is the meaning of the Upanisadic thought : Whatever exists in this transformable and non-transformable creation is pervaded by one entity and supervised by the same Lord.

May I say a few words regarding the benevolence that we find in this creation. Prior to our coming into being in this mortal frame, God

gave us light (of course, mainly from the Sun), and then corresponding eyes to see; God produced sweetness in honey and fruits prior to He gave us the tongue. He gave sweet melodies prior to our hearing potentialities. He gave just at the right hour sweet and nourishing milk in the breast of mother for the child. Prior to the coming of man on this Earth, he cooled down the surface of this planet, he grew the vegetation and had provided all the facilities of existence. The atmosphere was there full of oxygen, very well-balanced by the nitrogen content, he had carbon dioxide with all possibilities of its cycle, and similarly the nitrogen cycle. Everything is based not only on the principle of perfect economy but also on the principle of supreme benevolence. Man tries to disturb the equipoise in this Nature, but Nature brings out back the equilibrium by the ways it knows the best. Have you ever noticed the benevolence behind the processes by which damages are repaired in the animal and plant systems? When you have a little cut in your finger, the whole system of your body gets so adjusted as to bring out the repair in the most beautiful way. We have highly buffered biochemical systems in the body, and repair starts immediately. You have a little infection in your system, and the temperature rises. The rise of temperature is not a disease; it is a method of cure which has been provided by the benevolence of our Lord. For every toxin, the human system tries to produce an anti-toxin. For every ill and ailment, sometimes we have an immunity, individual and social. All this speaks of the bounteous benevolence present in our surroundings. To whom would you ascribe this benevolence? To the inert Nature? Or to the Conscious Being? That Conscious Being is thus not only Omnipresent, Omniscient and Omnipotent, He is also Most Benevolent. Such is our Lord.

A little terror, a little dread that exists in nature is also benevolent if we care to see to this simple fact. The greatest dread in life is that of Death. Only next to it is the dread of Old Age. Since very early days, man has tried to get over these two dreads of life. What is old age? It is merely the autumn of our life. Have you not seen that every year the old leaves of a tree dry up and fall to ground, only to give place to the new green ones with freshness. Autumn speaks of the glory of creation as much as the spring. So are our old age and death. Do you think that in case we had no old age and no death, the life in a family would have been heavenly? In fact, it would have been worse than that in a hell. My country had, when I was a school boy, a popu-

lation of 320 millions. Today she has the population of about 500 millions (plus the population of Pakistan which was included in the former figures). Suppose nobody had died during these years, what would have been the state of affairs? And therefore, I say, it is a blessing to society, that men die also whilst on the other hand they are born. Think of the conflict that would arise between old and young in a domestic family, if the old were to live for ever with their fossilized ideas. And therefore, I would say, God has been very kind to us when he provided to us with kindness the dread known as Death.

This is my intellectual approach towards our Creator and His Benevolence. And since He is Benevolent there is also an *emotional approach*. We are asked to love our Lord. He is our Mother and Father, He is our Brother and Friend. The *Vedas* speak of Him in all these terms. We have an affectionate connotation attached to these terms. And therefore, we speak of God in these terms. A child does not argue to love its mother; it has implicit faith in its mother. It does not know much of the mother, and yet it loves her. We do not argue to love a friend or a brother or a father. Love is there without reason. A child shows affection towards parents, a boy-brother shows affection towards his girl-sister, an adult youth is emotionally bound with the love of the girl-friend. Why is it that we cannot be bound without an argument with our Lord Who is so sweetly related with us? Why do we forget Him during our hours of existence? He does not forget us. He is present in our hearts. Have you not listened to His voice when He speaks out in your heart? The voice of conscience is the voice of our Lord. Those who listen to it and live to it have no fears; and those who ignore it repeatedly will no longer listen to it, and having killed their conscience, they are, as if doomed for ever. But our Benevolent Lord is still with them, lest they hear of Him for once even. This I call my emotional approach to God.

The emotional approach is always spontaneous. And still, have you not found in your society a rift between two brothers, between brother and sister, between husband and wife and also between son and his father? This is the vanity in man that causes the rift. The same vanity in us take us aloof from our Lord. Replace the vanity with humility, and all the broken emotional bounds are replaced. Humility would bring two broken hearts together. Humility would bring us nearer to our kith and kin. The same humility would bring man nearer his Lord. It costs nothing to be humble. Try to cultivate a little of this humility and you would find that it pays. It brings forth the sweetness which you have been missing. The attitude of humility is the attitude of prayer and is devotion. This is what I have been calling an emotional approach. This has been known as Devotion and Dedication.

The emotional approach leads to the community approach of our Lord, the *Social Approach*. I have been speaking of my Lord. I love to use the singular possessive *MY*. When I speak of MY mother, MY sister and MY country, I do not mean, that the mother, the sister and the country are exclusively Mine and do not belong to anybody else. My mother is my brother's mother also and so is my sister. I could have said, then OUR mother and OUR sister; but the plural possessive OUR has not that sweetness of relation as the singular MY. I speak in that context of MY Lord; He is your Lord too. He is the Lord of everybody present here in the audience. Love that Lord, love that Father. All of you have a right to address Him as MY or Mine. The moment you establish a relationship with this Lord, this Father, spontaneously a relationship is established amongst yourself too. He is My Father, you also call him as Your Father, every individual of you call him as His Father. Evidently, then I and you are brothers. You can please your father, when you and your brother are on affectionate terms. No father would appreciate two brothers living with conflict. Elder brother has a duty towards the younger. The rich brother has to be considerate towards the poor brother. A healthy brother has a duty towards the crippled one. All fathers love such sons as show these considerations. I have been calling this attitude as the *Social* or *Community Approach* towards our Lord or our Father. He prayeth well who serveth well in this sense. My relation with my Father at once establishes my relation with my brother. Just as emotional approach towards my Lord brings forth the humility in us, the social approach towards the same Lord brings forth the idea of service. Service is the best dedication. Dedication to God means dedication to society. Do not dedicate to society for your economic or political ends; that is no dedication. Dedication does not come out of utilitarianism; dedication is also not based on compassion. It is spontaneous. It is the theistic dedication. It flows out from within since He is Father of us all, and thus we are brothers. It is the selfless affection that binds us together. This is my social approach to theism. May He be with us, and may we be with Him. May we discard vanity to know more of Him. Of course, He never foresakes us; Many a time we forget Him He is always with us.